Improved Transfer-Matrix Schemes of Phenomenological Renormalization *

M. A. Yurishchev [a] [b]

[a] *L. D. Landau Institute for Theoretical Physics of Russian Academy of Sciences, 142432 Chernogolovka, Moscow Region, Russia*

[b] *Vasilsursk Laboratory, Radiophysical Research Institute, 606263 Vasilsursk, Nizhny Novgorod Region, Russia*

arXiv:hep-lat/9908019v1 18 Aug 1999

Different phenomenological RG transformations based on scaling relations for the derivatives of the inverse correlation length and singular part of the free-energy density are considered. These transformations are tested on the 2D square Ising and Potts models as well as on the 3D simple-cubic Ising model. Variants of RG equations yielding more accurate results than Nightingale's RG scheme are obtained. In the 2D case the finite-size equations which give the *exact* values of the critical point or the critical exponent are found.

1. Introduction

The phenomenological renormalization-group (RG) method [1] is a powerful tool for the investigation of critical phenomena. As it is known [2], phenomenological RG can be constructed by using not just the correlation length as it is done in Nigtingale's approach [1], but using any other quantity with a power-law divergence at criticality. Binder [3] suggested a phenomenological renormalization scheme by using the order-parameter moments (cumulants) which are, on the one hand, related to the higher susceptibilities and, on the other hand, immediately suitable for the Monte Carlo simulations. Recently Itakura [4] extended Binder's cumulant crossing method taking linear combination of several different reduced moments.

In this report, I discuss various RG transformations which follow from general scaling functional equations. These equations are evaluated in terms of the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the transfer matrices. By large transverse sizes of partly finite subsystems, all those transformations must yield the same results. However, for the small sizes which normally are used in practice, different RG equations lead to estimates with distinct accuracies. My aim is to find the best strategies of a phenomenological renormalization group method. This is especially important for 3D systems.

*Poster

2. Phenomenological RG Equations

Let us write the finite-size scaling equations for the *derivatives* of the inverse correlation length κ_L and the singular part of the reduced free-energy density f_L^s:

$$\kappa_L^{(m,n)}(t,h) = b^{my_t+ny_h-1}\kappa_{L/b}^{(m,n)}(t',h'), \qquad (1)$$

$$f_L^{s\,(m,n)}(t,h) = b^{my_t+ny_h-d} f_{L/b}^{s\,(m,n)}(t',h'), \qquad (2)$$

where $z^{(m,n)}(x,y) = \partial^{m+n}z/\partial x^m \partial y^n$ (z is κ_L or f_L^s), $t = K - K_c$ is the deviation from critical coupling, h is a normalized external field, y_t and y_h are, respectively, thermal and magnetic critical exponents of the system, d is the space dimensionality, L is a characteristic size of a subsystem and $b = L/L'$ is the rescaling factor.

In the phenomenological approach proposed by Nightingale [1], eq.(1) with $m = n = 0$ is combined with the ordinary expression for the inverse correlation length

$$\kappa_L = \ln(\lambda_1^{(L)}/\lambda_2^{(L)}), \qquad (3)$$

in which $\lambda_1^{(L)}$ and $\lambda_2^{(L)}$ are the largest and second-largest eigenvalues, respectively, of the associated

transfer matrix. In the absence of a symmetry breaking field, the critical coupling K_c is estimated from the equation

$$L\kappa_L(K_c) = (L-1)\kappa_{L-1}(K_c). \quad (4)$$

In writing this equation, one sets $L' = L - 1$.

Another possible way to produce a phenomenological renormalization group is obtained by using eq.(2) with $m = n = 0$. The fixed point is given by the relation

$$L^d f_L^s(K_c) = (L-1)^d f_{L-1}^s(K_c). \quad (5)$$

The dimensionless free-energy density, $f_L = f_\infty + f_L^s$, of a subsystem $L^{d-1} \times \infty$ is calculated by the formula

$$f_L = L^{1-d} \ln \lambda_1^{(L)} \quad (6)$$

and the "background" f_∞ is introduced as an extra parameter.

Besides eqs.(4) and (5), in this paper I also consider the following RG equations (resulting from the relations (1) and (2)):

$$\frac{\chi_L^{(4)}}{L^d \chi_L^2}\Big|_{K_c} = \frac{\chi_{L-1}^{(4)}}{(L-1)^d \chi_{L-1}^2}\Big|_{K_c}, \quad (7)$$

where $\chi_L = \partial^2 f_L/\partial h^2|_{h=0} = f_L^{s\,(0,2)}(K,0)$ is the zero-field susceptibility and $\chi_L^{(4)} = \partial^4 f_L/\partial h^4|_{h=0} = f_L^{s\,(0,4)}(K,0)$ is a nonlinear susceptibility (eq.(7) corresponds to Binder's phenomenological renormalization group);

$$L^{2-d}(\kappa_L^{(1)})^2/\chi_L = (L-1)^{2-d}(\kappa_{L-1}^{(1)})^2/\chi_{L-1}; \quad (8)$$

$$L^{1-d}\kappa_L^{(2)}/\chi_L = (L-1)^{1-d}\kappa_{L-1}^{(2)}/\chi_{L-1}; \quad (9)$$

$$L^{1-2d}\kappa_L^{(4)}/\chi_L^2 = (L-1)^{1-2d}\kappa_{L-1}^{(4)}/\chi_{L-1}^2. \quad (10)$$

Here, $\kappa_L^{(n)} = \partial^n \kappa_L/\partial h^n|_{h=0} = \kappa_L^{(0,n)}(K,0)$. Expressions for the derivatives of the inverse correlation length and the free energy with respect to h in terms of eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the transfer matrix are available in [5].

3. Results and discussions

To represent numerical data in tables, eqs.(4), (5), (7), (8), (9) and (10) will be labeled by symbols "κ", "f^s", "$\chi^{(4)}/\chi^2$", "$(\kappa^{(1)})^2/\chi$", "$\kappa^{(2)}/\chi$" and "$\kappa^{(4)}/\chi^2$", respectively.

Table 1
Estimates of K_c for the 2D sq Ising lattice; $K_c^{exact} = 0.440\,686\ldots$

eq.	$(2,3)$	$(3,4)$	$(4,5)$
(κ)	0.42236	0.43088 (-2.23%)	0.43595
$(\chi^{(4)}/\chi^2)$	0.42593	0.43242 (-1.88%)	0.43672
$(\kappa^{(4)}/\chi^2)$	0.42596	0.43243 (-1.87%)	0.43673
(f^s)	0.44324	0.44168 ($+0.23\%$)	0.44105
$(\kappa^{(2)}/\chi)$	0.47420	0.45153 ($+2.64\%$)	0.44626

In table 1, results for the critical coupling in the Ising model on a square lattice are given. The calculations were carried out for strips $L \times \infty$ with a periodic boundary condition in the transverse direction. The estimates are shown for the pairs $(L-1, L)$ with $L \le 5$. In the case of $(3,4)$ pairs, the errors are also given. The type of phenomenological RG equations which have been used are indicated in the first column of the table. In this model $K_c = \frac{1}{2}\ln(1+\sqrt{2})$ and $f_\infty = 2G/\pi + \frac{1}{2}\ln 2$ (G is Catalan's constant) [6].

It is seen from table 1 that the best lower bound is given by eq.(10). Slightly worse results are obtained by Binder's phenomenological renormalization-group procedure. This approach which is normally implemented by Monte Carlo simulations was used in the transfer-matrix version in [7]. Nightingale's renormalization (first line in table 1) which is traditionally used by transfer-matrix calculations has only the third position in accuracy among the lower estimates.

I also found the phenomenological RG equations leading to the upper bounds for K_c (last two lines in table 1). Among these more accurate results are provided by eq.(5). The magnitude of the error in line four of table 1 is the least among all lower and upper estimates of K_c. Unfortunately, such approach requires a knowledge about the background f_∞.

Transfer-matrix eigenvalues for the Ising strips are known in analytical form [6]. Using this fact I considered the RG transformation (2) which makes use of the first derivative with respect to K ($m = 1, n = 0; h = 0$). For the fixed point this

Table 2
Estimates of K_c for the 2D sq 3-state Potts lattice; $K_c^{exact} = 1.005\,052\ldots$

eq.	$(2,3)$	$(3,4)$	$(4,5)$
(κ)	0.96248	0.98350 (-2.1%)	0.99467
$(\kappa^{(1)^2}/\chi)$	0.99311	0.99920 (-0.6%)	1.00380
(f^s)	1.00927	1.00667 ($+0.2\%$)	1.00565

Table 3
Estimates of K_c for the 3D sc Ising lattice; $K_c^{exact} = 0.221\,6544(6)$

eq.	$(2,3)$	$(3,4)$
(κ)	0.21340	0.21826 (-1.53%)
$(\chi^{(4)}/\chi^2)$	0.21823	0.22002 (-0.74%)
$(\kappa^{(4)}/\chi^2)$	0.21824	0.22006 (-0.72%)
(f^s)	0.22354	0.22236 ($+0.32\%$)
$(\kappa^{(2)}/\chi)$	0.22658	0.22314 ($+0.67\%$)

transformation gives

$$L^{d-y_t} u_L^s(K_c) = (L-1)^{d-y_t} u_{L-1}^s(K_c), \qquad (11)$$

where $u_L^s = u_L - u_\infty$ is the singular part of the reduced energy density, and $u_L = \partial f_L/\partial K$. Remarkably, the root of eq.(11) is equal to the exact value of K_c since $u_L^s(K_c) \equiv 0$ for all L. In other words, all finite-size corrections to the background $u_\infty (= \sqrt{2}$ [6]) are zero.

Moreover, in the 2D Ising model $\partial\kappa_L/\partial K$ at $K = K_c$ is also independed of L and, therefore, eq.(1) with $m = 1$ and $n = 0$ gives the exact value for the critical exponent: $\nu \equiv 1/y_t = 1$.

The data obtained for the 3-state square Potts lattice are collected in table 2. For this model $K_c = \ln(1+\sqrt{3})$ and $f_\infty = 4G/3\pi + \ln(2\sqrt{3}) + \frac{1}{3}\ln(2+\sqrt{3})$ [8]. Inspecting table 2, it is seen that eqs.(5) and (8) lead to more qualitative estimates than Nightingale's approach. Again, the lowest absolute error is yielded by the phenomenological RG equation based on f_L^s.

Numerical calculations on strips $L \times \infty$ show us that in the 2D q-state Potts model the finite-size corrections to the background energy, $u_\infty = 1 + 1/\sqrt{q}$ [8], are also absent and, consequently, the equation

$$u_L(K_c) = u_{L'}(K_c) \qquad (12)$$

yields the exact value of K_c. Note that this equation has been derived earlier from other considerations [9].

Let us discuss now the results presented in table 3 for the 3D Ising model on a simple-cubic lattice. For this model $K_c = 0.221\,6544(3)$ [10] and $f_\infty = 0.777\,90(2)$ [11]. Renormalizations were done for the $L \times L \times \infty$ parallelepipeds with periodic boundary conditions in both transverse directions. As in the 2D case, the best lower values of K_c are obtained from eq.(10).

In the 3D case the amplitudes of the finite-size corrections to the critical-point energy are not equal to zero. As a result, eq.(12) only yields an approximate value of K_c.

The author thanks A. A. Belavin for stimulating discussions and valuable remarks. I am indebted also to M. I. Polikarpov for his encouragement. This work was supported by RFBR Grant Nos. 99-02-16472 and 99-02-26660.

REFERENCES

1. M. P. Nightingale, Physica **A83** (1976) 561
2. R. R. dos Santos and L. Sneddon, Phys. Rev. **B23** (1981) 3541
3. K. Binder, Phys. Rev. Lett. **47** (1981) 693; Z. Phys. **B43** (1981) 119
4. M. Itakura, cond-mat/9611174
5. M. A. Yurishchev, Phys. Rev. **B50** (1994) 13 533; Phys. Rev. **E55** (1997) 3915
6. L. Onsager, Phys. Rev. **65** (1944) 117
7. H. Saleur and B. Derrida, J. Phys. (Paris) **46**, 1043 (1985)
8. R. J. Baxter, *Exactly Solved Models in Statistical Mechanics*, Academic Press, London 1982
9. J. Wosiek, Phys. Rev. **B49** (1994) 15 023; *see also* A. Pelizzola, Phys. Rev. **B51** (1995) 12 005, I. Souza, C. Lobo and J. Seixas, Phys. Rev. **B55** (1997) 6356, P. Sawicki, hep-lat/9801006
10. A. L. Talapov and H. W. J. Blöte, J. Phys. **A29** (1996) 5727
11. K. K. Mon, Phys. Rev. **B39** (1989) 467